A.T.A.C.K

Angry Trannies* Against Cops and Kings

*and Dykes, Faggots, etc.

Last Shout 2023

Things got worse this year
But as in the days of yore
Before change, comes queer

Issue 7 Dec 23

Teach Your Children

Sex education has spent the last few decades a controversial topic because of the impossible expectation that children never hear a word about sex but also know everything about it by age 18. Well, except for all the stuff they're not supposed to know ever, like anything not needed for procreating through a hole in the sheet. And I could cite any number of reasons why this is an issue, but perhaps the most concerning is how a lack of sex education benefits predators.

Part of this is that children don't know anatomical terms for their own body. Due to society's ridiculous discomfort with talking about genitalia, it's disturbingly common for parents to teach their kids vague slang terms for these body parts instead. The less children know about their bodies, the less they know when an adult is doing something they shouldn't be. And if-G-d forbid-someone were to touch your child there, if they lack the words to describe it then they can't tell you what happened. It's well worth a little awkwardness to teach your children the right words for their own bodies, and tell them where adults shouldn't touch them.

Every once in a while there's some panic about teaching children consent, but really consent should be taught as early as possible. Consent isn't just about sex, either, and you can start by discussing acts of affection which children are familiar with, like hugs. Explain that they shouldn't hug someone unless that person says they want a hug, and conversely if they don't want to hug someone they don't have to.

And yes, this means you can't make your kid kiss their uncle anymore. No means no, full stop. If you want your kid to understand consent, that means respecting theirs. Otherwise you're just teaching them that their consent doesn't matter.

"But their uncle isn't a sex predator!" He very well might not be (or maybe he is, most predators are people the victim knows). But if he can't respect consent, that's a problem with him, not with your child. Either you want your child to believe that they have the right to say no, or you don't. You can't have it both ways.

ABOLISH DOCTORS

ATACK has written before about how doctors are cops and I fear some readers might mistake that for figurative prose. Doctors are like cops or whatever. After all, a doctor can't lock you up…

Can they..?

Okay so they fucking can. And you already knew that. But did you know they can lock you up with even less accountability than the cops get? Crazy, I know. Interesting choice of word there, but I'm keeping it. Anyway we've all recently been reminded of the steaming pile of authoritarian shite that is the Mental Health Act, whose many sections (hence the verb "to section" someone as in lock them up for being too mentally ill) give doctors and the courts powers to lock someone up indefinitely. This reminder came in the form of the sentencing of an autistic guy who hacked and attempted to extort the likes of Rockstar Games, and Uber. Victimless crime of course because how can a vampiric megacorp ever be a victim.

Judged too autistic to stand trial (by doctors), they slapped a Section 37 on him. Sure, that requires a jury but the jury isn't asked to determine guilt. Guilt requires criminal intent. They were just asked to assess whether the guy did the cyber-crime which of course he did. And of course he was "violent while in custody".

Why the fuck do they call it "custody"? It's imprisonment. Violent restraint. To respond to such violence with violence is the most natural human impulse that to hold it against someone is to punish them for asserting themself as a person. Which is the fucking crux of it isn't it. Too mentally ill and you're not a person. You gotta be put in "custody". To be "looked after".

What this looks like is a hospital order that can be renewed indefinitely by a single doctor for life, only lifted if the doctor feels that the person in "custody" is sufficiently treated as to earn release. Oh and also the other clause applies means the Justice Secretary has to approve it too. So good luck.

But the guy's autistic! That's not something that goes away. So either they traumatise him into compliance or lock him up forever. Either way, that's a teenager (did I mention he's eighteen?) that will never be free.

So fuck that.

Fuck tech giants.

And especially, fuck doctors.

The Revolution Will Not Be Monetised.

The revolution will not be algorithmically friendly.

The revolution will not be trending or have a hashtag.

The revolution will not be paused for a word from our sponsors.

Because the revolution will not be monetised.

I'm old enough to remember when the internet was more than a half dozen websites trying to compete for your time and attention. I remember when we shared stuff because we wanted to; when speech actually WAS free, rather than carved into 280-character soundbites or polished to perfection in thirty minute long YouTube videos.

I remember when two way communication meant that we all spoke on an equal standing rather than elevating those of us who are pretty enough to garner a following. Back before corporations had figured out how to enclose the internet; how to put a harness on our dissatisfaction and hand the reins to fascists and reformists.

Now the internet is a hundred thousand Howard Beales, taking their turn to shout righteous anger into the void, before the void turns around and sells that anger back to our communities with a special $10 Patreon tier for access to a private discord server.

We're mad as hell, but we'll keep taking it so long as the stream of content never stops.

We've built an efficient machine to keep the discourse rolling, to provide an infinite number of Hot Takes, to show us the problem in countless new and exciting ways, without ever letting us articulate a solution.

Except, that is, for solutions soaked in the blood of minorities.

The machine sure does love those.

They're good for clicks.

But the revolution will not be monetised.

Because the revolution will not give a single shit about con-current views, subscribers or superchats.

The revolution will be a desperate scream.

The revolution will not be a choice.

Or the revolution will not be.

CIS-ADJACENT?!

what the fuck is cis adjacent? aren't you just also misgendering me? like what is even meant by this? i feel like someone took the concept of being conditionally cis passing, misapplied it, twisted it, then decided they had a better word for it. it's one thing to acknowledge power dynamics involved in situationally flying under the radar of transphobes, quite another to decide that negates someone's actual identity and means their gender isn't as authentically trans as another.

obviously passing as cis isn't the goal for everyone either, do i need to say that even? even for binary trans people, weren't we all on the same page that it's something where if you want it good for you everyone supports your transition goals, but also if you don't care about it good for you your transition goals are also valued? i thought we fucking agreed on these things: that everyone's transition is their own!

but for people and beings outside the binary, what would cis passing even mean as a goal to have? if i want to be seen as something not found in the traditional gender binary, clearly passing as cis isn't a goal. so what then does it imply to say that such an individual is not only seen as cis, but that their gender is in fact adjacent to cisness? is my problem with the concept clear here? if we as trans people respect the rights of other trans people to transition how they want to, i would think it would fly in the face of that ethos to say that one person's transness is less because it doesn't follow a particular trajectory.

i'm pretty sure if you think of "nontransitioning" trans people outside the binary (read: at this point in time have had little if any medical transition care, may or may not want to have any in the future, and may or may not have significant barriers to any transition care they do want) as being cis adjacent you're just actually participating in the continued erasure of swaths of trans people as being ourselves.

if you say one of us passes as cis, and is therefore cis adjacent, you are also denying our identities, especially because cis passing is not a goal for us as a general rule.

[sidebar: if a nonbinary trans person describes themselves thus, it should be respected, but sometimes it's this exact shit causing that person to internalize the "not trans enough" message.]

but also: consider that not having a medical transition or not transitioning in certain ways doesn't mean the person isn't getting transphobic hate ever, and that cis passing is always always always conditional? because we're not cis if we're not cis. there's no adjacent about it unless we say there is first.

obviously some trans people (binary as well as not) have shit to unpack with internalized stuff and people in situations where privileges and oppressions intersect to create various power dynamics should 1000% be aware of those, but that does NOT make them less trans if they get misgendered as cis for whatever reason. fuck you if you wanna join in on it to be honest.

HEY!

You.

Yeah, you.

You look like you've got something to say.

Come shout it with us.

Yell any submissions to atackuk@proton.me

Or at people in the street but we can't promise to publish those.